

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_97368
Title of the Manuscript:	Upgrading Knowledge and Skills of Nursing Students in Infection Control: An Interventional Study
Type of the Article	Data Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalirjo.com/index.php/IRJO/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Write abstract in more structured format (IMRD) 2. Please add place in the title. 3. Establish the need for the study at the end of the introduction. 4. write either aims or objective of the study 5. Wording of the objective is not clear(objective no. 1,2,3) 6. In research question variable knowledge is mentioned but nowhere it is reflected in the objective or aims..please clarify 7. Methodology part was not clear, how the training part implemented???? 8. Article need lot of modification not properly structured and lack scientific wordings.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Need modification	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Barkha Devi
Department, University & Country	Sikkim Manipal University, India